Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi (2009) 2/1

THE PROBLEM WITH THE "POST-" :WHAT WILL BE IN USE TOMORROW?

Mehmet Ali ÇELİKEL*

Keywords:
Modernism, postmodernism, postcolonialism, periodisation.

Anahtar Kelimeler:
Modernizm, postmodernism, postkolonyalizm, dönem.

Abstract

When the use of the terms "postcolonialism" and "postmodernism" particularly in the writings of the British authors from the former colonies is taken into consideration, questions are raised as to whether these terms will ever be relevant in the future with the prefix "post". They contradict not only themselves but also one another. While they have been used within the last fifty years as the suitable terms with reference to the texts written by the contemporary authors of the colonial origin, some argue that they are the products of late capitalism and the colonial intellectuals in cooperation with the western academia. However, it may be argued that both of these terms are compatible as they have come into use more or less within the same era. All the postcolonial works studied in this essay bear postmodernist characteristics. This situation does not necessarily suggest that all postmodernist works are postcolonial, while most postcolonial works present postmodernist elements. When the two terms are studied periodically, both of them refer to the aftermath of their predecessors. Therefore, this study questions the relevance of these two terms in the future, since they may be the predecessors of new forms.

Özet

"POST"UN SORUNLARI: GELECEKTEKİ KULLANIM NE OLACAK?

İngiliz edebiyatında, özellikle sömürge kökenli Britanyalı yazarlar tarafından yazılan metinlerde, "postcolonialism" ve "postmodernism" terimlerinin geçerliliği göz önüne alındığında, "post" önekiyle kullanılmaları nedeniyle bu terimlerin gelecekte de geçerli olup olmayacakları sorusu gündeme gelmektedir. Bu terimler yalnızca kendi kendileriyle değil, birbirleriyle de çelişmektedir. Son elli yıl içinde sömürge kökenli yazarlarca yazılmış metinleri nitelemek için uygun görülen terimler olmasına karşın, bu terimlerin geç kapitalist dönemin ve batının akademik dünyasıyla işbirliği içinde olan entelektüellerin ürünü olduğunu öne süren kuramcılar bulunmaktadır. Bununla birlikte, aynı döneme rastlamaları nedeniyle, her iki terimin de birbiriyle uyumlu olduğu öne sürülebilir. Bu çalışmaya dâhil edilen metinlerin tümü postmodernist özellikler içermektedir. Elbette bu durum tüm postmodernist metinlerin "postcolonial" olduğu anlamına gelmemektedir, ancak birçok "postcolonial" metin postmodernist öğeler barındırmaktadır. Bu terimler tarihsel olarak incelendiğinde, her ikisinin de kendilerinden önceki dönemin sonrasını niteledikleri görülmektedir. Bu nedenle; bu çalışma, bu iki terimin gelecekteki geçerliliğini tartışmaktadır, çünkü gelecekte bu terimler de muhtemel yeni formların öncülü haline gelebilirler.

* Yrd. Doç. Dr., Pamukkale Üniversirtesi, İngilizi Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümü, Denizli
e posta: macelikel@pau.edu.tr

1

Postmodernism and postcolonialism are two of the most debated literary theories of the late twentieth century. The difficulty of defining both of these terms has deepened since they gained critical currency. In order to understand such a problematic term as postmodernism, a historical review of the term is needed, despite the dangers of periodising a term that refers to an artistic style or mode. The conditions for the existence of the term depends on, as Fredric Jameson asserts, "on the hypothesis of some radical break" from the earlier artistic forms, ideologies and also on the extinction of the modern movement (1991:1). Jameson dates the beginnings of postmodernism back to the end of the 1950s or the early 1960s (1991:1).

During World War I and the years leading to World War II, modernist art and literature dominated the era. According to Malcolm Bradbury and James McFarlane, modernism was a style that breaks away from "familiar functions of language and conventions of form" despite the fact that it seems "central to the evolution of the literary and artistic tradition" in some nations (1991:23, 24). It still raises important questions today, as does postmodernism. What was it? Was it definable? What were its limits? Or did it have any limits? How did it feel to read a modernist text? The periodisation of modernism is equally difficult, just as is that of postmodernism. It is none the less necessary to try to pin down the term.

2

If the word "modern" were taken to mean contemporary, it would be possible to call today's world and its literary output modern. However, the term 'modernist' generally refers to artists using a "wide variety of movements subversive of the realist or the romantic impulse and disposed towards abstraction" (Bradbury & McFarlane: 23). Frank Kermode has questioned the concepts "modern" and "modernism" in the same manner and suggested that somebody needed to write the history of the word "modern" (1968: 27). The problems with such terms included both periodisation and academic and popular usage (Kermode, 1968: 27), because the movements included in modernism, such as Impressionism, Post-Impressionism, Expressionism, Cubism, Futurism are not the movements of one kind, and "some are radical reactions against each other" and one can argue that modernism becomes an "invisibly communal style" in graphics, architecture and literature (Bradbury & Mc Farlane: 23, 24)). To refer to the variety of uses of the term and its various definitions in different nations, Peter Brooker declares that "there is plainly more than one modernism, and not all modernisms are equal" (1992:1).

Marguerite Alexander, referring to the fact that modernism cannot be defined under a generalising title, suggests that its elements can be observed in different literary forms and includes T. S. Eliot and Yeats among poets, and James Joyce and Virginia Woolf among modernist novelists on the basis of the view that "language elicits a direct response from the reader, independently of meaning," because she defines one of the major characteristics of modernism as the

foregrounding of language (1992:6), because modernism is about style. It refers to a break from the traditional styles and forms by foregrounding the unique style of the authors. The works of modernist writers are "self-referential, generating meaning only as the parts that relate to the whole" (Alexander, 1992:6). From this point of view, Alexander regards Ulysses as the paradigmatic modernist text, and sees the modernist text "as an impersonal artefact, comparable to other art forms" (1992:6). It is possible to link Ulysses to the artistic forms such as Dadaism or Surrealism in terms of its aesthetic devotion to the stylistic novelties and in terms of its anarchic release from the old dependencies of style and narration (Bradbury & McFarlane: 26-7). Melvin J. Friedman argues that books like Ulysses were made possible by the Symbolist practices in France and Ulysses is more than a novel particularly because of "the crossing of time and space", "the relationship between the characters and time" which all refer to "the concern with the relationship between art and life" (Friedman, 456, 457).

One might argue here that the modernist novel roughly defined by its language use and narration that breaks itself from the traditional and conventional dependencies does not only present itself as a new literary movement but also as a combination of the movements in non-literary artistic forms like painting in the early twentieth century. However, the difficulty of determining the demarcation lines in literature and arts in different nations complicates the term further and deepens the contradictions.

If, then, modernism is to be taken to refer to the early decades of the twentieth century when these modernist writers produced their "artefacts", chronologically modernism can be attributed to this period. Nevertheless, this would be a definition and periodisation of Anglo-American modernism excluding other modernisms and limiting the period suggested by Malcolm Bradbury and James McFarlane. Bradbury and McFarlane choose a forty-year period from 1890 to 1930 as the period of concentration to study modernism, because its boundaries and demarcations are still in constant dispute (1991:13). Moreover, there were literary texts exhibiting modernist characteristics well before the late nineteenth century. Laurence Sterne's Tristram Shandy has, for instance, been regarded to be one of the very early examples of "the stream of consciousness," which is a literary technique associated with the writings of the early twentieth-century modernists, especially Joyce, Woolf, and TS Eliot. On the other hand, it has also been suggested that Tristram Shandy embodies many "postmodern" characteristics (Alexander, 1990:11).

The reason why Bradbury and McFarlane study the movement within so large a time span is that the periods and geographies of the modernist movement vary, because

(n)o single nation ever owned Modernism, eve though many of the multiform movements of which it was made did have national dimensions and origins in specific regions of European culture. Many if not most of its chief creators crossed frontiers, cultures, languages and ideologies in order to achieve it. (13)

Although Bradbury and McFarlane point out that modernism started in the 1890s and dominated an era until the 1930s all over Europe and America, both the North and South, they all had different starting points of modernism in that period (13). The cultural and geographical varieties created different forms of modernism in Russia, Berlin, London, Vienna, Prague, and Paris (Bradbury & McFarlane: 13). Within the modernist movement, various literary movements and manifestos such as naturalism, symbolism, impressionism, decadence, vorticism, imagism, Italian and Russian futurism, Dadaism and surrealism still have influences in literary world (Bradbury & McFarlane: 23).

3

The problems with modernism are also observed in the studies of postmodernism. The vagueness of the term lies in the fact that it is the aftermath of a movement that has not yet been defined in properly satisfactory terms. While the boundaries and demarcations of modernism are still in dispute, trying to find the definition of its post is, in Brian McHale's terms, even more problematic. (1987: 3) In Alexander's words, the term postmodernism sounds like a joke, because it is 'used to describe certain kinds of late-twentieth-century fiction (1990:3). Alexander points out that the word "carries a suspicion of trickery, for how can anything already acknowledged as existing, postdate the modern, if we take 'modern' to mean contemporary?" (1990:3). For Brian McHale, the term "does not even make sense" for

if "modern" means "pertaining to the present," then "post-modern" can only mean "pertaining to the future," and in that case what could postmodernist fiction be except fiction that has not yet been written? Either the term is a solecism, this "post" does not mean what the dictionary tells us it ought to mean, but only functions as a kind of intensifier (1987:4).

McHale's argument is similar to that of Alexander. Whether or not the term is understood to refer to a period makes the debate more complex. The ambiguity of the term that McHale suggests is true. One cannot use such a term if modern means contemporary. In this sense, how can we claim the existence of something that is to come? McHale's and Alexander's initial reservations in their criticism are certainly of importance.

Postmodernism, in Linda Hutcheon's terms, "manifests itself in many fields of cultural endeavour – architecture, literature, photography, film, painting, video, dance, music, and elsewhere" (1989:1). This is the reason postmodernism's characteristics lie in a kind of "wholesale 'nudging' commitment to doubleness, or duplicity" (Hutcheon, 1989:1). Hutcheon uses the term postmodernism to refer to cultural, social and artistic innovations in the late twentieth century (1989:1-2). Raman Selden et al. present the uses of the term as problematic, and draw the distinction between "postmodern", "Postmodernity" and "postmodernism" pointing out their interchangeable usage (1997:201). They suggest that, "postmodern" and "Postmodernity" should be used for general developments within this period to reserve 'postmodernism' for developments in culture and arts (1997:201). However, they point out further problems even in

this usage. Due to the prefix "post", it is a relational term, and can be seen to denote the continuation of modernism (Selden et al., 1997:201). Hutcheon, too, admits postmodernism's inherent relationship to modernism, but she declares, like Jean-François Lyotard, the postmodernity designates "a social and philosophical period or 'condition'", and thus differentiates postmodernism and postmodernity (1989:23). Despite the confusion and admitted inherent relationship to modernism because of its prefix, postmodernism is taken rather a break from modernism than being its continuity. Postmodernism arrived, according to Jameson, from "an essentially antimodernist standpoint" (1991: 56). Jameson's claim here both justifies and denounces McHale's assertion that "post" is an intensifier of modernism (1987:4). If the "post" is an intensifier as in McHale's view, then postmodernism is not an antimodernist standpoint. None the less, if Jameson's argument is held as a definitive standpoint against modernism, then postmodernism is a reaction to, or a break from modernism.

Jean-François Lyotard's description of what he calls the postmodern condition indicates the fact that postmodern aesthetics does not originate from modernism (1984: 76). Lyotard studies the term not as an artistic and literary movement, but as a cultural condition and suggests that the term is merely an eclectic term that results from the degree zero of contemporary culture: one listens to reggae, watches a western, eats McDonald's food for lunch and local cuisine for dinner, wears Paris perfume in Tokyo and 'retro' clothes in Hong Kong: Knowledge is a matter for TV games. It is easy to find a public for eclectic works (1984:76).

From Lyotard's perspective, then, postmodernism cannot be taken to refer to a literary form. It is a form of eclectic presentation. All "[a]rtists, gallery owners, critics, and public wallow together in the 'anything goes' in the absence of aesthetic criteria" (Lyotard, 1984:23). Postmodernism is a switch from high culture to low culture. It is a radical break from modernism's high tastes. It replaces modernism's orthodoxy with heterodoxy. Postmodernism "contradictorily promises a global oneness, 'the one human universe'" (Brooker, 1992:13). Thus, it recognises the cultures of the world rather than a unique culture. Hutcheon regards the concept of culture in postmodernism as plural and thus, Culture, "(with a capital C and in the singular) has become cultures (uncapitalised and plural)" (1989:23). This happens despite "the homogenising impulse of the consumer society of the late capitalism", which is "yet another postmodern contradiction" (Hutcheon, 1989:23). Therefore, postmodernist culture or cultures have "a contradictory relationship to what we usually label the dominant or liberal humanist culture" (Hutcheon, 23). Hutcheon adds that this multiplicity or in other words the heterodoxy defines postmodernism's relation to modernism (1989:23). It is inevitably contradictory, though it is understood to be the continuation of it. However, Hutcheon points out that it "marks neither a simple and radial break from it nor a straightforward continuity with it: it is both and neither" (1989:23).

All new styles are difficult to define and all novelties face criticism. Modernism was also rejected in the beginning by the orthodoxy. As quoted by

Brooker, Virginia Woolf, despite being among the modernist authors, found James Joyce and T. S. Eliot "indecent and obscure", and conceded to a more traditional form of modernism (Brooker, 1992:5). This type of modernism established high modernism. It now has its own orthodoxy, which is challenged by postmodernism's heterodoxy. Postmodernism is said to be neither a break from modernism nor continuity with it. However, Brooker refers to Ihab Hassan's definite and straightforward table of features contrasting modernism and postmodernism. According to Hassan's table, Romanticism, symbolism, form, purpose, design, hierarchy, creation, centring, metaphor, narrative as the major characteristics of modernism is replaced in postmodernism by pataphysics, antiform, play, chance, anarchy, decreation, dispersal, metonymy, anti-narrative (Brooker, 1992:11). This schema has been criticised for being categorically and locally inconsistent, because the opposition of metaphor and metonymy is not consistent with that of narrative and anti-narrative. Hassan, nevertheless, is committed to his views of regarding modernism as "centred", and postmodernism as "de-centred" and "indeterminate" (Brooker, 1992:12). This is true when compared to Hutcheon's views, because postmodernism is plural and sets itself against a totalising global oneness.

However, Frederic Jameson regards postmodernism as both historical and political rather than a mere style (1992:179). He believes that "the emergence of postmodernism is closely related to the emergence of this new moment of late, consumer or multinational capitalism" (1992:179). It is agreeable in a sense, because the age of multinational capitalism began most significantly after the Second World War and created scenes of multiple cultures. As such, American society can only be represented as a multinational society, which is the outcome of huge migrations of workers and particularly entrepreneurs wishing to find opportunities in a capitalist economy. The whole western world, that is Western Europe, Canada, Australia and all parts of the world where western European culture is dominant, has now become multinational societies because of migrant workers and entrepreneurs. Among these countries, particularly Britain and France have multicultural communities not only due to the renewed rise of capitalism but also to their colonial background.

Consumer or multinational capitalism inevitably affected artistic representation. After modernism, which dominated the universities, art galleries, and the museums, postmodernism came as a reaction. Jameson indicates that the modernist authors and poets such as Joyce, Proust, Eliot and Pound who were "felt to be scandalous or shocking" by the traditional modernists became "the establishment and the enemy" for the generation of the 1960s to destroy in order to forge something new (1992:165). Certainly, there are many forms of postmodernism as there were forms of modernism. The postmodernism Jameson defines is "the erosion of the older distinction between high culture and so-called mass or popular culture" (1992:165). This postmodernism, therefore, challenged the academic standpoint which "has traditionally had a vested interest in preserving a realm of high or élite culture against the surrounding environment of philistinism of schlock and kitsch" (Jameson, 1992:165).

Nevertheless, if postmodernism is regarded as philistinism surrounding the traditional academic standpoint, then it should be remembered that the radically anti-traditional modernist writers were seen as obscene and indecent initially. Salman Rushdie, for instance, is not a popular writer. His novels are by no means an "easy read", although his novels are regarded as postmodern. Gabriel García Márquez is also regarded as a postmodernist writer whose novels cannot be regarded as "philistine".

However, Jameson is in doubt whether postmodernism can be affirmed to be an opposition against its own society, like the older modernism was; or a reproduction or reinforcement of the logic of consumer capitalism. He raises a more significant question as to whether it is, in a way, a resistance to that logic (1992:179). He asserts, in contradiction, that pastiche and parody are among the most significant features of postmodernism and Thomas Mann was interested in pastiche and certain chapters of Ulysses are its "most obvious realisation" (Jameson, 1992: 177). Therefore, what is new about it, and "[d]o we really need the concept of postmodernism?" (Jameson, 1992:177). He answers this question by periodisation and drawing a radical break between modernist and postmodernist periods.

That there is a danger in periodisation of all literary styles or movements, because it is always possible to see the features of a movement in a certain period in history, occurring in another style in another period. This is true in the case of modernism and postmodernism. As Brenda K. Marshall states, there are postmodern moments in Tristram Shandy, but there is nothing postmodern about trhe contemporary magazines like Newsweek or Times (1992:5). However, whether we call it postmodernism or not, it is still used to refer to the literatures written in particularly multinational, multicultural and consumerist societies, and it proves to be useful to periodise it.

Marshall's definition of postmodernism starts from a minimal statement. "Postmodernism is about language", she says, it is about:

how it controls, how it determines meaning, and how we try to exert control through language. About how language restricts, closes down, insists that it stands for some thing. Postmodernism is about how "we" are defined within that language, and within specific historical, social, cultural matrices. It's about race, class, gender, erotic identity and practice, nationality, age, ethnicity. It's about difference. .... Postmodernism is about history. .... It asks: Whose history gets told? In whose name? For what purpose? Postmodernism is about histories not told, retold, untold (1992:4).

When it comes to speaking of differences and ethnicity in postmodernism, Jameson's definition of postmodernism as the representation of the logic of capitalism does not seem to be verifiable. It is true that multinational capitalism generates an eclectic culture, which is a significant feature of postmodern culture. In addition, it is true that eclecticism creates a pastiche in the works of art.

However, capitalist eclecticism or philistinism does not totally constitute a postmodern aesthetics, because as well as eclecticism, pastiche and popular

tastes, magical realism and historiographic metafiction also lie within the descriptions of postmodernism (Hutcheon, 1988: 105). in the view of several critics. I am much more in favour of Marshall's definition of postmodernism than Jameson's, though it is insufficient, because the representation of an eclectic consumerist society does not include ethnicity and historiographic metafiction. Rushdie and Márquez's texts do not represent a view of capitalist society as such. Hanif Kureishi, in a sense, might be regarded as the representative of an eclectic aesthetics of capitalism, but this kind of categorisation would exclude his descriptions of postcolonial immigration that causes cultural clashes. Arundhati Roy's The God of Small Things, for instance, is not a result of capitalist logic, but her experimental approach to the conventions of the novel. The pastiche she produces and the sense of magical realism and mysticism are among the features of postmodernism. The problem with postmodernism, in this sense, may be in the similarity of Márquez and Rushdie who come from two distinct cultures producing similar postmodern aesthetics.

Therefore, it is not only multinational capitalism that constitutes an unprecedented aesthetic, as the examples of pastiche and eclecticism were seen in the texts of the early twentieth century, such as Ulysses, Finnegans Wake and even in Tristram Shandy as anti-novel in the eighteenth century. What may be called postmodernism, then, started with the cultural diversity of the late twentieth century. The postmodernism I am dealing with, therefore, is not that of the multinational capitalist representation, but that of cultural clashes, of the East and the West meeting, of history, and of pluralism, multiculturalism and ethnicity, which are all the results of postcolonialism which is another problematic term both periodically and stylistically.

4

Defining and periodising postcolonialism is no easier than speaking about postmodernism. We always have to clarify which postcolonialism we are talking about. What is clearer about postcolonialism is, compared to the difficulties of postmodernism, that it is more certainly a continuation. It is much easier to say that it is a continuation of colonialism, than saying that postmodernism is a continuation of modernism, because there were postmodern moments well before modernism began. On the other hand, postcolonial moments did not exist before colonialism started. It is also much easier to periodise it. It, in the simplest terms, comes after the end of colonialism. If it is taken to mean a style rather than a period, however, it is rather a break from colonialism than continuity.

None the less, the issue of chronology is not that easy. Deepika Bahri minimally defines it as what has been "preceded by colonisation" (51). Even this minimal definition is full of "ideological content" (Bahri, 1995:51). Simply naming it "postcolonialism" is to refer to colonialism and imperialism. It is also a reference to history in a very fundamental sense. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin use the term to refer to all the cultures "affected by the imperial process from the moment of colonisation to the present day," however, "more than three-quarters of the people living in the world today have had their lives

shaped by the experience of colonialism" (1989:1-2). World history has not been devoid of colonialism at any point. There have always been colonised lands in some part of the world in any phase in history, and there are colonialisms still in full swing in the contemporary world. Therefore, if we are to pin down the term to chronological terms, it appears to be quite a difficult task.

The term postcolonialism may refer to the period after colonialism, but whose colonialism is it? The fact that the term has been in use, like postmodernism, in the second half of the twentieth century, and the fact that the term was coined in Europe after the disintegration of European colonialism makes the term rather Eurocentric. Peter Childs and Patrick Williams point out that this excludes the "early nineteenth-century Latin America and the end of Spanish and Portuguese control" (1997:1). South America had a postcolonial period, too, in this sense. Aijaz Ahmad argues that we can talk about colonialisms well before the European colonial experience began, such as Arabic, Ottoman and Chinese colonial ventures. He brings the term forward to cover all kinds of national oppressions today. As such, the ongoing British rule in the Falklands, Belize or in Hong Kong up to 1997 may be cited as examples. Then, from Ahmad's point of view, colonialism "becomes a trans-historical thing, always present and always process of dissolution in one part of the world or another" (1992:9).

Stephen Slemon introduces various definitions of postcolonialism, but the concept for him proves most useful not when it is used synonymously with a post-independence historical period in once-colonised nations, but rather when it locates a specifically anti- or post-colonial discursive purchase in culture, one which begins in the moment that colonial power inscribes itself onto the body and space of its Others and which constitutes as an often occulted tradition into the modern theatre of neo-colonialist international relations (1991:3).

It looks easier to define the term as a movement with a certain stance against colonialism rather than trying to periodise it. Childs and Williams, in this perspective, state that "texts which are anti-colonial, which reject the premises of the colonialist intervention (the civilising mission, the rejuvenation of the stagnant cultures) might be regarded as postcolonial". They liken the difficulty with the chronology of the term to the older debates about "whether modernism (and subsequently postmodernism) was best understood as a historical period or literary/cultural style" (1997:4). Perhaps, the term, when used in this sense, should be "anti-colonialism".

Bahri shares this point of view by declaring that "the notion of 'postcolonial' as a literary genre and an academic construct may have meaning(s) completely separate from historical moment(s)" (1995:53). Despite this, the term cannot be thought separately from colonialism, just as postmodernism cannot be thought separately from modernism. Therefore, history and chronology are not separable from it. It still refers to precedence before itself. In this respect, there are two kinds of uses of the term. One is meant to be the historical period that comes after colonialism. The other is the style and condition in which "the colonised peoples seek to take their place, forcibly or otherwise, as historical subjects" in

Elleke Boehmer's words. Boehmer suggests that postcolonial must be "distinguished from the more conventional hyphenated term post-colonial", which she takes as a period term designating the post-Second World War era (1995:3). Postcolonial, as the unhyphenated form, is, in this sense, a cultural and political condition designating the aftermath of all experiences of colonisation.

Vijay Mishra and Bob Hodge, following Boehmer, welcome its usage in both forms, but distinguish them sharply. When the hyphen is dropped, ostcolonialism is always a "present tendency in any literature of subjugation marked by a systematic process of cultural domination". They do not regard this form as "post" something, and point out two classifications they make within the unhyphenated form. One is "oppositional postcolonialism" which is found in post-independent colonies and in chronologically "post-colonial" era. The second type they refer to is "complicit postcolonialism" which was always present "underside" within colonisation itself (Mishra & Hodge, 1991:407). The difference from Boehmer's usage here is that they add the suffix "ism" to Boehmer's postcolonial literature which she regards as a style that "critically scrutinises the colonial relationship" rather than "simply being the writing which 'came after' empire". However, this classification by Boehmer is in contradiction with her own definition of "colonial" and "colonialist" literatures (2). Colonial literature, she states, is a general term taken to mean "writing mainly concerned with colonial perceptions and experience, written mainly by metropolitans, but also by creoles and indigenes, during colonial times" and it did not refer to colonial matters (Boehmer, 2). She exemplifies this with Dickens's novels or Trollope's travelogues "reinforcing perceptions of Britain as a dominant world power" in colonial period, but not referring to colonial experience or the colonies Boehmer, 3). On the other hand, colonialist literature was 'specifically concerned with colonialist expansion' and was written 'by and for colonising Europeans about non-European lands dominated by them' (Boehmer, 2-3). If colonial literature that refers to colonial expansion is called "colonialist literature", then postcolonial literature that scrutinises colonial relations and generates a reversed discourse should be called "postcolonialist literature".

If both of the terms were used with an "ism" added to the end, it would clarify their ideological and cultural orientations more explicitly regardless of their periods, which seems to be useless to talk about, as there are more than one type of colonialisms and postcolonialisms. In addition, the suffix "ism" would also refer to a certain manner and style. For instance, in the colonialist literature, not in the colonial one, the colonised peoples were the "Other". They were the representatives of the alien culture to be explored and redefined. The metropolitan intellectual shaped the discourse. Therefore, the coloniser's perspective was dominant over the indigenous culture. Postcolonialist literature, on the other hand, changed this discourse. Indigenous intellectuals shaped the discourse, and the perspective became that of the colonised. The colonisers became the "Other" to be redefined.

The term is certainly criticised by many scholars. First of all, it is inevitably Eurocentric, because it was coined by the Anglo-American and French academia

after the Second World War upon the disintegration of their colonial empires to refer to the situation. It explicitly excludes the other colonial experiences. However, the term does not only remain Eurocentric and exclude non-European colonialisms, but it also appears to exclude Spanish and Portuguese colonialisms in South America. The term, in addition, tends to keep the literature of the United States out of its territory, although it is a postcolonial culture. The exclusion of the USA is due to its current position of power and the neo-colonising role it plays, according to Ashcroft who, despite using the term to cover all cultures affected by colonial experience, is concerned with it as if "it exists during and after the period of European imperial domination" (1989:2). It is useful here to go back to Deepika Bahri who admits that "postcoloniality [is] integrally tied to European imperialism" (56). Bahri argues that because the term is defined and used now, it "discourages us from transcending the temporal in two ways" (56). First of all, "it prevents an understanding of colonialism outside the modern period," and "the 'post' in postcolonial is in fact a temporal fiction, as several others before [her] suggested" (Bahri, 56).

Although it would be too exclusive to admit, the term refers to the colonies that gained independence after the Second World War. Therefore it is not only Eurocentric, but also Anglo and Franco centric. When considered in the unhyphenated form, the most significant examples of postcolonialist literature came out of the indigenous authors of former European colonies. What has happened to earlier colonies then? American literature does not have a postcolonial nature, nor does Latin American literature which is still called "Latin". We cannot speak of a significant literature, which may attract an academic interest, written by the colonised culture in the imposed imperial language in South and North America because they are settler colonies where European culture is still the dominant one even after the independence, and most of the population is still predominantly European.

Bahri argues that it may be "misleading and, worse, unhelpful to think of 'postcolonial issues' as only those marked by European imperialism" (1995:58). However, postcolonial literature refers to the literatures of the formerly colonised nations, and those literatures are not regarded as postcolonial unless they are written in the imperial tongue. In their vernacular, they would be called national literatures. In this respect, postcolonial literatures are still under the impact of imperialism. The earlier postcolonial literatures, if we may call them so, such as Latin American, are not scrutinised under the same title. Western academia became more interested in postcolonialism from its former colonies. This is inevitable, because even long after the colonialism, cultural and economical imperialism still continue, and the formerly colonised nations are still dependant both economically and culturally on their former colonisers. Besides, no other colonial ventures until the European colonial experiences had been so influential. The European colonisation from sixteenth century onwards and its dismantling in the second half of the twentieth century constitutes an unprecedented phenomenon: the large scale post-war immigration. Thus, the answer to the question "When is post-colonial?" is "now" according to Childs and Williams

who declare that there may not have been a more postcolonial condition than this (1997:2).

Childs and Williams use the term to refer to a historical period as well and think that it is, just like postmodernism, a phase of imperialism and is best understood as "the globalising of capitalism", which means it has an inescapable dimension (1997:21). In this sense, Ahmad fins the term unacceptable because "it apparently privileges colonialism" (1995:9). Anthony Appiah is much more militantly critical of the term:

Postcoloniality is the condition of what we might ungenerously call a comprador intelligentsia: a relatively small, Western-style, Western-trained group of writers and thinkers, who mediate the trade in cultural commodities of world capitalism at the periphery (1991:348).

Having said that, postcolonial criticism is introduced in the West through the intellectuals of formerly colonised origin who cooperate with the Western academia. This accusation clearly hints that the term postcolonialism can never be thought separately from colonialism. Arif Dirlik's argument is not at all different from Appiah's. He states that postcolonialism started when Third World intellectuals have arrived in the Western academia (1994:329).

The term is, then, paradoxical in all senses. It is, on the one hand, used to emphasise the literature of opposition and resent, on the other, used to satisfy the needs of the Western academia, putting that literature in a situation in which it is wanted to be seen. That is, the cooperative intellectuals convert it into a Western interest. When Appiah and Ahmad's views are considered, it is seen that it introduces the formerly colonised land through imperial eyes. The authors of these literatures are known in the west through the indigenous culture they represent. Their representation is, however, not that of an authentic originality, but of a satire directed to both cultures, particularly pointing out how postcolonial immigrants may be in 'amusing' situations when they meet the western cultures. This is one of the harsh criticisms directed to Rushdie for ridiculing the subcontinental cultures in the eyes of the western public, for example. The fury of the postcolonial Muslim world at The Satanic Verses originated from this point, despite the fact that it is a novel of migration, the loss of identity in the postcolonial condition, and a novel that amalgamates Eastern literary forms with those of the Western tradition along with references to Islamic, Christian and Greek myths.

As for the contradictions of postcolonialism, Childs and Williams ask how "post" might be added to colonialism that has not yet fully disappeared (1997:7). This very question has been directed to postmodernism as well. The answer would be that postcolonialism, like postmodernism, is a condition rather than a period. It is a term to refer to a break from colonialism. However, postcolonial condition is another form of colonialism for Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak who claims that "we live in a post-colonial neo-colonised world" (1990:166).

Despite all the criticisms and debates around the term postcolonialism, it still comes as a handy word to refer to a certain sub-genre. Not only is postcolonialism a literature of opposition to colonialism from an ideological and

historical perspective, but a literature that has adopted western genres to challenge both the vernacular and the western. Salman Rushdie's literature, for instance, is a collaboration of Western novel genre and Eastern oral story-telling devices. Both of them have remained in their authentic forms in Rushdie's texts where they are also both challenged. Another example for the collaboration and conversion of the genres is Arundhati Roy's The God of Small Things. She challenges the imperial language, imperial literary styles and discourses by reformulating English grammar and creating hybrid forms.

Mishra and Hodge catalogue the features of postcolonialism as "fracture, interlanguage, polyglossia, subversion", and slippage of language, deferral of meanings, dialectical process of relations between the margins and the centre, discourse of marginality, meanings that are not culture-specific and meanings that are constructed metonymically, not metaphorically (1991:409, 412). Postcolonialism is also rather ideological than being stylistical. Homi K. Bhabha suggests that postcolonial discourse intervenes in "ideological discourses of modernity that attempt to give a hegemonic 'normality' to the uneven development and the differential, often disadvantaged, histories of nations, races, communities, peoples" (171). It formulates its critical revisions around the issues such as "cultural difference, social authority" to reveal ambivalent moments in modernity (1994:171).

Postcolonial literature foregrounds cross cultural conditions. It is its natural tendency to have a converted discourse, because the intention of postcolonial fiction is, as Ania Loomba suggests, "to allow the voices of once colonised peoples and their descendants to be heard" (2). Inevitably, postcolonial discourse, not in the chronological but in stylistical terms, is a break from and an opposition to the more dominant colonial discourse, as suggested by Peter Childs and Patrick Williams' who argue that the premises of colonialist intervention have lead to a counter-attack in the post-colonial fiction (4).

As aforementioned, Marshall's definition of postmodernism includes language, culture, history, difference, ethnicity, race, class, nationality, identity, thus hybridity, parody, alternative histories and realities. Postcolonialism's inherent features include these, too, because it came into being when the former imperial subjects began writing to the centre. That is, they began borrowing the western literary genres only to hybridise them with eastern storytelling techniques. The new cultural characteristics, new narrative devices and even new words, for instance in Rushdie's texts, Urdu and Hindu words used without translations in English texts; bring a sense of resistance to the forms of the novel which is a western genre. The discourse of postcolonialism has therefore influenced the structures. Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, like many critics, study the term along with post-structuralism (1992:162).

The period in which the postcolonialism in question came into being is the second half of the twentieth century, which is the same period as the emergence of the debates whether there is a postmodernism or not. Since they both came into academic interest in the same historical period, postcolonialism and postmodernism are compatible for both stylistic and historical reasons.

Postcolonialism is inevitably postmodern, but not all types of postmodernism are postcolonial. If postcolonialist discourse is said to convert the colonial discourse by bringing the marginal to the centre, the same principle is relevant for postmodernism, because postmodernism converts the accepted forms of perspective and literary principles. For instance, Jameson regards postmodernism as being fascinated by the degrading landscape of "schlock and kitsch, of TV series and Reader's Digest culture, of advertising and motels", because it has emerged from "a purer stage of capitalism than any of the moments that preceded it" (2, 3). Postmodernism is a switch from high culture to low culture.

In this respect, postcolonialism switches from western culture to ethnic cultures. Therefore, postcolonial discourse forces the structures both in themes and forms as in the novels of Salman Rushdie who employs ethnic words from Urdu and narrative styles from Persian, Arabic and Urdu literary traditions particularly in Midnight's Children. His employment of native words from Urdu turns his text into a multilingual collage presented within a novel written in English form. Rushdie's frequent use of phrases such as "Once upon a time..." in Midnight's Children (1981:9) bring the elements of eastern fairy tales into novel, which is a western literary form. His narrative liberties are, thus, not only composed of a multilingual composition, but also of a multicultural combination of styles.

Arundhati Roy's The God of Small Things employs linguistic liberty that can be associated with both postcolonialism and postmodernism. Roy's twins Estha and Rahel speak English in their own way. They reformulate the English grammar that is what Roy particularly foregrounds. The twins' formulations of the grammar rules, words and the pronunciations in English put forward the fact that it is not their own language, and it is imposed upon them. However, the imposer in the novel is not the imperial colonisers, but an Anglophile uncle and an Anglophile auntie. Their perception of the grammatical rules and pronunciations, however, is worth noting:

> Margaret Kochamma told her to Stoppit.
> So she Stoppited. (141)

It is obvious in the text that English is not the language of the characters of the novel. However, the language of the novel is English. This is typical of postcolonialism. The central characters are the ones who were subjected to colonialism, and who were in the margins in colonial discourse. It is also postmodern when considered from the perspective of postmodern theory. The formulations, italicised sentences and the thoughts of twins and their perception of the world deployed throughout the text invite a deconstructionist reading of the novel. The structure is not that of the classical novel. Roy shares this paradigm with Rushdie. I would like to suggest that it is the effect of oral story telling tradition to foreground the mispronunciations, ungrammatical sentences and deconstructing the text with authorial interventions. It is equally difficult to determine where the narrator is in Roy's text as in Rushdie's texts.

Another postmodern characteristic also seen in postcolonial discourse is magical realism, which is attributed to postmodern authors such as Rushdie and Márquez. Márquez's magical realism originated in the South America, the continent that accommodates as many legends, myths and mysticism as the subcontinent. Rushdie's magical realism originates from Persian and Arabic literature. The motif of magic flying carpet from Arabian Nights, or Alladin's Lamp is what Rushdie admits to have been influenced by. The use of these devices in a novel in English language not only brings ethnic and alien features to the west in postcolonial discourse, but also formulates a postmodern discourse.

These features introduced into the western novel genre by the emergence of postcolonial discourse transform and distort the western rhythms in the novel. Multiculturalism, tragi-comedy, hybridity, racial and national differences are all presented in English language whatever they are and wherever they come from. Whether we call it postmodern or postcolonial, the type of representation in both discourses deforms the inherited genres and generates sub-genres.

From Anne McClintock's point of view, the ubiquity of "post" words in current culture, such as postcolonialism, postmodernism, post-structuralism, post-Marxism, post-feminism, post-national, post-historic, even post-contemporary, signals "a wide spread, epochal crisis in the idea of linear, historical 'progress'" (254). It is more problematic that "the historical rupture" suggested by "post" belies "both the continuities and discontinuities of power that have shaped the legacies of formal European and British colonial empires" (McClintock, 254-256). As the former imperial powers get stronger, the former colonies get poorer in today's world shaped by these historical ruptures.

As suggested by the definitions so far, both postmodernism and postcolonialism are conditions. They refer to the situations shaped by a strong western world that imposes those conditions as the conditions of development. The connotations of the postcolonial condition are the situation of migrants in the western world in the aftermath of colonisation. There would not have been a postcolonial theory if there had not been colonialism in the first place. In this sense, if it were not for the unprecedented migration to the metropolitan centre from the former colonies, we would not be reading the novels of Rushdie, Kureishi and Roy that depict the reality of the postcolonial hybrid character. Moreover, this hybridity created a hybrid world for the postcolonial character, and it inevitably leads to a postmodern collage.

Whether it be an eclectic, consumerist capitalist culture that created the postmodern aesthetic; or whether it be the postcolonial migration and the opposition to colonisation that created the postcolonial representation, it is a worthwhile truth that the literary theories invented to refer to the new aesthetics in the second half of the twentieth century always denote to the specific conditions of this age. As the world is becoming a place of multiple powers and histories, there is urgency for "innovative theories of history and popular memory". This paper suggests that we must be thinking of what terms might "adequately replace" postcolonialism and postmodernism, if terms are ever

adequate (McClintock, 1994:266). We must be thinking of what kind of a place the world will be in future, and what the aesthetics of artistic representation will be. In this perspective, the terms we are using for certain styles will not be adequate, as those styles represent the conditional realities of this age.

5

Postmodernism and postcolonialism - if only the uses of these terms with their "isms" attached are welcomed – have so far been used interchangeably in this study. The literary characteristics attributed to postmodern condition may be applied to postcolonial fictions in most cases, as in the brief exemplifications from Rushdie and Roy in particular. If postmodernism is a result of the late capitalist period, postmodern aesthetics presents the eclectic cultural condition of consumerism. Postcolonial fiction or fictions equally present an eclectic aesthetics not only stylistically but also thematically. This eclecticism, in a similar way to postmodernism, recalls the condition of multiculturalism, the clash of cultures and literary forms. The tenets of the postmodern fiction such as intertextuality, collage, historiographic metafiction, magic realism and parody are also observed in the works of the prominent postcolonial authors such as Rushdie, Kureishi and Roy. These authors use satirical heroes, parody the colonial history, create historiographic metafiction by suggesting alternative colonial histories, and form a linguistic collage by using words from their native languages within the English text.

Nevertheless, the similarities between these two movements not only allow an interchangeable use of these terms, but also point to the fact that they are both formed and used in relation to their predecessors; even though the demarcation lines between these movements and their predecessors are not clearly drawn and their relationship with former ones as to whether they are continuations or alternatives has not been firmly established. While postmodernism refers to the aftermath of modernism, postcolonialism refers to the aftermath of colonialism. The ambiguity of the prefix "post" continues. It has not been firmly defined whether it is a periodical, a stylistic or an ideological prefix. In all of these periodical, stylistic and ideological senses, the relevance of the prefix post remains an obscurity in the future of the literary studies. In a constantly changing cultural condition, what will be in use in a literary condition in which the postmodern and the postcolonial fictions might be the predecessors of possible new forms and movements is not merely a rhetorical question.

REFERENCES

Aijaz, A. (1992) **In Theory: Classes, Nations, Literatures**. London: Verso.

---. (1995) "The Politics Of Literary Postcoloniality", **Race And Class,** 36, 3: 1-20.

Marguerite. A. (1990) **Flights From Realism: Themes And Strategies In Postmodernist British And American Fiction**. London: Routledge.

Anthony, A. K. (1991) "Is The Post- In Postmodernism The Post- In Post-Colonial?" **Critical Inquiry.** 17.2, 336-357.

Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G. & Tiffin, H. (1989) The Empire Writes Back: **Theory And Practice In Post-Colonial Literatures.** London: Routledge.

Deepika, B. (January 1995) "Once More With The Feeling: What Is Postcolonialism?" Ariel: A **Review Of International English Literature.** 26:1: 51-82.

Bhabha, H. K. (1994) **The Location Of Culture.** London: Routledge.

Elleke, B. (1995) **Colonial And Postcolonial Literature: Migrant Metaphors.** Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bradbury, M. & Mcfarlane, J. (1991) **Modernism: A Guide To European Literature** 1890-1930. London: Penguin.

---. (1991) "Preface", In Bradbury & Mcfarlane (Eds.) (1991) **Modernism: A Guide To European Literature 1890-1930.** London: Penguin. 11-6.

---. (1991) **"The Name And Nature Of Modernism"**, In Bradbury & Mcfarlane (Eds.) (1991) Modernism: A Guide To European Literature 1890-1930. London: Penguin. 19-55.

Brooker, P. (1992) (Ed.) **"Introduction" In Modernism/Postmodernism.** London: Longman: 1-33.

Childs, P., Williams, R. J. P. (1997) **An Introduction To Post-Colonial Theory**. London: Prentice Hall/Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Dirlik, A. (Winter 1994) "The Postcolonial Aura: Third World Criticism In The Age Of Global Capitalism", **Critical Inquiry**. 20, 328-356.

Friedman, M. J. (1991) **"The Symbolist Novel: Huysmans To Malraux",** In Bradbury & Mcfarlane (Eds.) (1991) Modernism: A Guide To European Literature 1890-1930. London: Penguin. 453-66.

Hutcheon, L. (Spring 1987) "Beginning To Theorise Postmodernism". **Textual Criticism.** Vol. 1, No. 1, 13-23.

---. (1989) **The Politics Of Postmodernism**. London: Routledge.

---. (1989) **The Poetics Of Postmodernism.** London: Routledge.

Jameson, F. (1991) **Postmodernism: Or The Cultural Logic Of Late Capitalism.** London: Verso. 1991.

---. (1992) **"Postmodernism And Consumer Society" In Brooker** (Ed.) (1992) Modernism/Postmodernism. London: Routledge. 163-179.

Kermode, F. (1968) **Continuities**. London: Routledge.

Loomba, A. (2005) **Colonialism/Postcolonialism.** London: Routledge.

Lyotard, J. F. (1984) **"Answering The Question: What Is Postmodernism**?" Trans. Régis Durand, In Lyotard, J-F. The Postmodern Condition: A Report On Knowledge. Trans. Geoff Bennington & Brian Massumi. Manchester: Manchester University Press. 71-82.

Marshall, B. K. (1992) **Teaching The Postmodern: Fiction And Theory**. London: Routledge.

Mcclintock, A. (1994) **"The Angel Of Progress: Pitfalls Of The Term 'Postcolonialism"**, In Francis Barker, Peter Hulme & Margaret Iversen, Eds.

(1994) Colonial Discourse / Postcolonial Theory. Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press. 253-266.

Mchale, B. (1987) **Postmodernist Fiction.** London: Methuen.

Mishra, V. & Hodge, B. (Winter 1991) "What Is Post(-)Colonialism?" Textual Practice. Vol. 5, No. 3, 399-414.

Selden, R., Widdowson, P. & Brooker, P. (1997) **A Reader's Guide To Contemporary Literary Theory.** 4th Edition. London: Prentice Hall/Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Slemon, S. (1991) "Modernism's Last Post," In Ian Adam & Helen Tiffin, Eds. Past The Last Post: Theorising Post-Colonialism And Post-Modernism. Hemel Hempstead: **Harvester Wheatsheaf.** 1-12.

Spivak, G. C. (1990) **The Post-Colonial Critic: Interviews, Strategies, Dialogues**. London: Routledge.